

Miami, FL, deserves our gratitude for her dedication and service on behalf of the citizens of Florida and our Nation.●

#### BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH AT THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, in the waning days of any Congress, the full range of emotions are not far from the surface in each one of us. We feel the thrill of success as we see our legislative initiatives become law and the disappointment of knowing that some of our priorities must await a new year. As I leave the Senate after thirty years of service, I leave next year's challenges to others.

Among the bills that did not become law this year is S.1897, a bill to revitalize the National Institutes of Health. This bill is the fine work of my friend and colleague Senator NANCY KASSEBAUM. Once the Senate passed the bill last Thursday, Senator KASSEBAUM worked tirelessly to try to achieve an agreement with the House to pass the bill. Unfortunately, an accommodation could not be reached and as a result, many fine legislative provisions that would dramatically improve the work of the NIH, fall to the wayside this year. This is all the more frustrating given the fact that the House hasn't held one hearing on NIH this year and essentially stopped the bill because they hadn't had a chance to give input.

Mr. President, I have a passion for medical research. It provides the sole hope for an improved quality of life for so many who suffer. Congress has recognized the importance of biomedical research by providing a 6.5-percent increase for the National Institutes of Health this year. We provided a 5.7-percent increase last year—all told an increase of 12.2 percent over a 2 year period. I can think of few domestic discretionary programs which have received this kind of attention in this Congress and none with greater merit. In terms of return on our Federal investment, there is no program which brings greater return in terms of improving quality of life in this country.

I have four pieces of my own legislation attached to S. 1897, all of which I believe will be enacted over time. While not accomplished on my watch, I am hopeful that others in the Senate will take on these initiatives and insure their passage. Senate bill 184 codifies the Office for Rare Disease Research at the NIH. This office has been created in the appropriations process to coordinate the research on over 5,000 rare diseases—diseases that affect only a small portion of the population and frequently have no research project or registry. I have been attempting for 2 years to have the office codified in law and while the Senate has passed this bill twice, it has not become law.

The NIH bill also includes S.684, the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Assistance and Education Act of 1995. Mr. President, this bill has over 62 co-

sponsors in the Senate and over 100 in the House. It establishes Parkinson's Disease research centers across this country and signals the NIH that Congress is not satisfied with the \$30 million that NIH currently spends on this disease—my bill calls for an \$80 million investment to cure this disease. I would like to compliment that Parkinson's community, and particularly Joan Samuelson of the Parkinson's Action Network, for the work they did to propel this bill forward. The Parkinson's community has my deepest respect for their advocacy.

The bill also includes S. 1251, a bill that Senator HARKIN and I have long championed to establish a National Fund for Health Research. The version included in Senator KASSEBAUM's bill established the shell of the fund, and left the financing mechanism to a future Congress. My preference is a tobacco tax and a Federal income tax kickoff, but a range of options exist. The important point is that a trust fund recognizes the fact that the appropriations process will never yield adequate resources to fund the promise of scientific research which exists today. We need to do more and the American public, in opinion poll after opinion poll, has indicated they support us doing so.

Finally, the NIH bill includes a new initiative of mine, the Clinical Research Enhancement Act, S. 1534. This bill will increase funding for clinical research, improve training for persons planning clinical research careers, and modify the focus of the NIH to make it more receptive to clinical research proposals.

There is no question that NIH needs more resources to fund all research. However, as we seek to find these funds, we must also look within NIH to ensure that the environment is supportive for clinical research applications. A recent report from the Institute of Medicine presents some alarming trends: the number of young investigators applying for grants dropped by 54 percent between 1985 and 1993, the number of federally funded grants awarded to persons under the age of 36 has decreased 70 percent in this period, and at the same time, young investigators are racking up average debt loads of \$63,000. If not rectified, these trends will result in a stunning lack of human infrastructure to deliver a knowledge base that has applicability to or utility for the benefit of patients. It is not an understatement to assert that clinical research is in a state of crisis. Such a crisis may lead to a serious deficiency of clinical expertise, a paucity of effective clinical interventions, an increase in human suffering, and ultimately, an increase in the cost of medical care.

All of these initiatives deserve our support. I am pleased that the Senate has endorsed them and I hope that the new Congress will begin where we ended this year and include these provisions as a starting point on the new version of the NIH revitalization bill.

Before I conclude Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a report by Washington Fax of a hearing that I chaired with Senator COHEN on September 26, 1996. This was a significant hearing and I hope my colleagues will take the opportunity to review its content.

The report follows:

#### EXTRAORDINARY HEARING GRIPS SENATORS, WITNESSES, AND OBSERVERS

No one noticed when, but at some point ego and arrogance got up and left the Senate hearing room.

It may have been when the witnesses began to talk:

Gen. Norman Schwartzkopf, relating a sad commentary on the American male acting like an ostrich when it comes to prostrate cancer and other maladies;

Joan Samuelson, a 46-year-old lawyer diagnosed with Parkinson's disease nine years ago, relating how almost immediately things dear to her—playing the piano, running, backpacking—were taken from her, and then essential functions began to be stripped away;

Rod Carew, a Baseball Hall of Famer introducing us to his daughter, Michelle, via video tape—recalling her smile in the final days of her 18-year life.

And then there was Travis Roy of Yarmouth, ME, a 21-year-old quadriplegic who recalled his life's dream lasting 20 seconds on the hockey ice, and now he must wants to hug his mother and his girlfriend.

Then, at first haltingly, almost embarrassingly, the room began to fill with emotion—honest straight-from-the-heart emotion, rising from the experience of one human being listening to another and hearing.

The scene was a special joint hearing Thursday by the Senate Committees on Appropriations and Aging called to gather testimony on the benefits of biomedical research and the human cost of injury and disease.

As the first panel of witnesses spoke, the hubbub and noise of self-importance and pressing tasks, always a part of a congressional hearing, slowly stopped. The audience breathed ever so lightly; the door from the room stood unused.

Distances began to disappear. None remained between the dias, where Sens. Connie Mack, R-FL; Robert Bennett, R-UT; Conrad Burns, R-MT; William Cohen, R-ME; Mark Hatfield, R-OR; David Pryor, D-AR; John Glenn, D-OH; and Herb Kohl, D-WI, were seated, and the witness table.

The trappings of a hearing were dropped. It was like sitting around a supper table, where friends who know each other warts and all open themselves, trusting their companions to share thoughts, to understand, to help, to reach out and touch where it hurts.

Carew, Samuelson and Roy with great dignity opened their souls, because they want to help stop the pain—not only theirs—but the pain of others too. Hatfield and Cohen, the good hosts, allowed the mood to reign.

At one point, Mack, at Hatfield's gentle nudge, began to speak, but knowing he couldn't trust his voice, sat quietly waiting. There was no embarrassment for him, only great feelings of empathy. The wave of emotion passed, and he talked of the death from cancer of the brother he loved so much. There was a path of empathy from Mack to Carew.

Pryor spoke up. "Talking about one's personal hurts is hard," he said frankly. But he went on to relate how his son, a lawyer, thought he had injured an Achilles tendon playing racket ball. When the surgeon got inside my son's leg, they discovered a rare

form of malignant tumor on the tendon, said Pryor. If it had been only a few years earlier, my son would have lost his whole leg, and a short time before that, he would have been doomed, he said.

When Hatfield called upon Bennett, the Utah Senator didn't respond. He obviously wanted to speak, but his grief was so cutting that it took a bit to pass. He directed his remarks to a young researcher who was on one of the witness panels. She had described in her testimony watching the president of Brigham Young University, Rex Lee, lose his battle with cancer. Bennett revealed that Lee was his best friend.

There was a lull in the conversation, and someone recalled the discussion earlier, when Samuelson described how her day goes. "From the moment I am awake, I wonder, 'how will my body react today?'" she said. "Initially it is always stiff and sluggish and unpredictable until it adjusts to medication. For the first hour or two, I cope with a sudden sharp tremor in one or both hands, or one leg suddenly freezing up or contorting in a way that prevents walking. Crawling around the house is sometimes the only way to keep getting ready as I wait for the drugs to begin to work."

Then Mack, with an edge to his voice, questioned aloud, "When are we going to do something about this? To provide what is needed?"

Hatfield warned that funding for biomedical research is not going to continue to increase and may not even hold stable, because in 1999, 2000 and through 2002 there isn't the money to carry out deficit reductions. "We are trying to balance the budget by taking money from only 18% of the budget," he emphasized. "And that isn't enough to do the job."

This was the last hearing that will be chaired jointly by Cohen and Hatfield. It was probably the most honest hearing on the Hill in a lot of years. Senators came face to face with why research is important. The witnesses now know these Senators as kindred souls who hurt as they do, a new reason to fight on through the pain and the grief.

Egos and arrogance left the room and honesty, caring and empathy remained. No heroes, just folks trying to figure out how to help each other.

#### DELAWARE COMPANY HONORED AS FAMILY-FRIENDLY

• Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, in this time of two worker households, working parents are increasingly faced with the difficult task of balancing work and family.

Every day in this country, families must find a way to meet the challenges that await them at home after a long day on the job. Some days it seems impossible to maintain a career while trying to figure out a way to get the shopping done, put dinner on the table and pick up the kids at soccer practice.

That is why today, Mr. President, I am proud to stand here to announce that Delaware companies are taking the lead and making it easier for working parents to balance their careers and families.

One particular company, MBNA America, which is based in Wilmington, DE, was recently honored as one of the top 10 family-friendly companies by Working Mother magazine.

This is the second straight year that MBNA has been named as one of the

top ten companies for working mothers and the fifth straight year that it has been named in the top 100.

Also, in the September 16 issue of Business Week, MBNA was named as one of the top 10 businesses in terms of their work and family strategies. This is the first time that Business Week has rated companies for their family friendly practices, and it shows that businesses are most successful if they take their work and family strategies seriously.

Speaking about MBNA, Business Week stated that "the bank won the highest grades from employees, who cited strong programs and job flexibility."

MBNA is to be commended for instituting policies and programs that are sensitive to the realities of two income families.

For example, MBNA offers three on-site day care centers that serve MBNA employees. I have had the opportunity to visit one of the two centers that are in Delaware, and I cannot stress enough what a benefit it is for workers to be able to take advantage of these day care centers. In Delaware, these centers give the parents of around 400 children the peace of mind that their child is in good hands.

Also last year, 109 men and 264 women took advantage of childbirth leave of absences that averaged 13 weeks. This is a wonderful opportunity for parents to be there for those precious first weeks of their child's life.

Another important benefit that is offered by the company is adoption assistance of up to \$5,000. This allows employees to provide a stable home and family to a child who needs that love and stability so badly. Just another way that companies can help build strong families.

Employees can take advantage of \$849,000 in company-sponsored college scholarships that allow those who wish to better themselves the opportunity to do so. After all, education is the greatest investment this country can make.

Working Mother magazine also applauded MBNA for having flexible work hours by utilizing job-sharing strategies and compressed work weeks.

And, the study showed that women account for a high percentage of executive positions at MBNA. Women make up 39 percent of vice presidents at MBNA and 16 percent of all senior executives are women.

Besides MBNA, two other Delaware companies were honored recently as family friendly companies. DuPont and DuPont-Merck Pharmaceutical were named as two of the top one hundred companies by Working Mother magazine for their leadership in creating job strategies that are sensitive toward families. DuPont was also named in Business Week's top10n list, and other companies with facilities in Delaware, such as Hewlett-Packard and Nations Bank, have been praised for their family oriented policies.

Mr. President, these work strategies that take into account everyday family life do not just benefit the employees, but also the employer. There is little doubt that recruitment, retention, morale, and therefore productivity all increase when companies implement family-friendly policies.

I am proud that MBNA and other Delaware companies have emerged as leaders in creating family work strategies, and I hope that this trend continues throughout Delaware and throughout the country. •

#### INTERNET CENSORSHIP AND CHINA

• Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, almost 1 year to the day after the Senate approved the Communications Decency Act [CDA], the Federal District Court in Philadelphia concluded that congressional approval of the CDA was "unquestionably a decision that placed the CDA in serious conflict with our most cherished protection—the right to choose the material to which we would have access."

Mr. President, this fall the Supreme Court will consider an appeal of that Federal District Court decision, issued in June 1996, which found the CDA to be unconstitutionally vague and a violation of free speech. The action by the Supreme Court will, without doubt, be one which determines whether the Congress will continue to encroach upon one of our most fundamental rights.

The Communications Decency Act was badly flawed in a number of ways—and I have spoken of those flaws often and in great detail on the floor of this Senate—but its most serious flaw was that it criminalized speech transmitted via the Internet which the Supreme Court has ruled is protected by the first amendment—so-called indecent speech. While its proponents claimed to be most concerned about sexually explicit and obscene materials on the Net—the transmission of which is already a violation of criminal law—the CDA swept more broadly, effectively prohibiting speech which is perfectly legal if it appears in a newspaper, magazine, or book.

Mr. President, when I and other Senators pointed out the great danger of the act's overly broad prohibitions of on-line speech, we were told that we were overreacting. We were told that this minor erosion on speech rights will not lead to greater restrictions on the rights of Americans.

But, Mr. President, what danger could be greater than a Congress willing to subjugate speech rights to the political needs of the day? While indecency may have been the target of Congressional disapproval in 1995, when the Communications Decency Act was first considered, the target of our current political climate appeared to be violence in media. The Senate Commerce Committee has considered and reported legislation that puts the Federal Government in the business of determining